DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 641 RC 019 615

AUTHOR Warner, Linda Sue
TITLE The Legal Framework for Parental Involvement in Indian Education.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Education; Court Litigation; Educational History; *Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Indian Relationship; *Federal Legislation; *Parent Participation; *Tribally Controlled Education; Tribal Sovereignty
IDENTIFIERS Bureau of Indian Affairs

ABSTRACT

Indian control of Indian education, whether defined as control by the individual parent, parental school board or committee, or tribal council, has had legislative support since the passage of the Indian Self-Determination Act in 1978. While the authority for overseeing the federal trust responsibility for Indian people remains with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, contemporary educational agenda have been directed to include laws and regulations that impact public school districts as well. The legal framework for involvement of Indian parents in the education of their children has its basis in past and present federal legislation. Several laws that impact Indian students were incorporated into legislation that sought to protect parental rights of all parents, yet have far-reaching consequences for the involvement of parents in Indian education. This paper highlights the requirements or allowances for parental involvement in the Johnson O'Malley Act, Impact Aid, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Indian Elementary/Secondary School Assistance Act, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the Indian Child Welfare Act, the Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments, and the Native American Languages Act. A reference list of public laws, articles, books, and court cases is included. (KS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 641

The Legal Framework for

Parental Involvement in Indian Education

Linda Sue Warner
Assistant Professor of Education
Educational Administration Program
The Pennsylvania State University
320 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 4-8, 1994.

RC 019615

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Sue Warner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Legal Framework for

Parental Involvement in Indian Education

The authority for overseeing the federal trust responsibility for Indian people has been incorporated into the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), within the Department of Interior. Historically, this branch of the federal government has represented **the** authority in Indian country, particularly during periods of assimilation. Contemporary activities are narrowly focused as a result of legislation.

These activities focus on the fulfillment of federal trust responsibility to tribal entities. It is important to understand that this trust responsibility relates to tribal interests. Activities within the Bureau are categorized into one of two primary responsibilities: education (ED) and the balance of the bureau (BOB) which oversees resources.

Education within the Bureau of Indian Affairs is commonly understood as control of reservation boarding schools; however, this is not the only function of the education programs. Currently, the BIA operates 186 schools and dormitories. Boarding schools were originally designed as instruments of assimilation; yet recently, the Bureau has entered into contracts permitting local tribal or community control of some schools.

Over the years, the Bureau has been "bashed" and bitterly criticized. One fundamental complaint against theBIA's administration of trust responsibility goes beyond the BIA to the Department of Justice. The BIA maintains the responsibility for defending the tribes' assets. Threats to these assets can come from other agencies within the Department of the Interior and their constituencies. As Interior's stepchild, the BIA does not have the political clout to battle these other agencies. The obvious consequence is that Indian interests may suffer when compromises are made at the Secretary's level.

The trust relationship is reevaluated when the conflict is moved to the courtroom. The BIA is initially represented by the Solicitor's office within the Department of Interior and, if the matter should go to court, by the Department of Justice. Both of these offices have responsibilities to other agencies; frequently agencies with which the tribes are in conflict. Conflict of interest specifically involving Indian tribes is not unusual within the government. The Supreme Court has made it clear that in such circumstances, tribes cannot be favored (Nevada v. United States, 463 U.S. 110, 127. (1983)). Tribes are

not relieved of the res judicta effect of a judgment merely because the government represented both the tribes and those who competed with them (Arizona v. California, 460 U.S. 605, 626-28 (1983)).

While the trust responsibility for education has been debated and ignored by Executive priority over the years, the courts have supported education for Native Americans. The courts have asserted in some opinions that while no legal obligation can be found in an analysis of treaties, the federal history of emphasizing its moral obligation for education is obvious (Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indians v. U.S. (1945) and Prince v. Board of Education (1975). Considering the history of Indian-non-Indian affairs, the number of court cases which specifically address education is minimal. This may be correlated with the relatively small number of laws which specifically address educational issues for Indian students, in fact, several pieces of significant legislation is, in fact, a minor portion of legislation directed at non-Indian issues.

Legislation

The education of American Indian students is impacted by federal legislation on several levels. The following federal laws provide the legislative foundation for education of American Indians. Emphasis one the requirements or allowances for parental involvement are highlighted.

- Johnson O'Malley Act
- Impact Aid
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act
- Indian Elementary/Secondary School Assistance Act
- Education for All Handicapped Children Act
- Indian Child Welfare Act
- Elementary and Secondary Improvements Amendments
- Native American Languages Act

The first legislation which affected Indian schools, Indian students, parents and tribes in any substantial manner, e.g., increased resources, were minor section of laws which affected public school funding. The Johnson O'Malley Act (passed in 1934 and reauthorized as recently as 1991) was the impetus for parent committees to oversee the activities funded in this program. The actual authority for

spending money remained with the fiscal agents at the local public school, therefore, whether an intended or unintended consequence of this legislation, minimal individual parent input was ever achieved.

Impact Aid laws passed in 1950 (and reauthorized in 1991) have been the center of considerable debate over the years. Impact Aid monies are grounded in the government to government relationship of the United States and federally recognized tribes. This funding is directed at public school districts which are impacted significantly by the absence of a tax base as the result of district boundaries which include non-taxable (specifically trust) land.

Indian parents have input into the application processes and may individually or collectively use the formal complaint system in dealing with public school districts; however, there are many areas where the public schools have the ultimate decision-making authority over the usage of these funds.

One of the earliest attempts to respond to the needs of Indian students and parents, in terms of curricular input, was again a rider to legislation that was designed primarily for public school education. In 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, public schools were targeted to make curricular reform efforts for Indian populations. Prior to this time, state schools lacked any obligation to offer programs specifically for Indian children, even in densely populated school districts and this legislation sought to encourage more tribal and individual parental involvement. Specifically it began to fund "special supplementary programs for the education and culturally related needs of Indian students". (2701 (a)).

The Indian elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act in 1968 authorized tribes to bid for discretionary aid for education programs such as demonstration schools or pilot projects for the improvement of educational opportunities. This Act dealt with state school funding. This legislation sought to involve Indian parents in a more meaningful role in the development of educational priorities for their children. The programs supported by this Act were conditional based on consultation with Indian parents and approved by an Indian parent committee.

In 1975, with the passage of the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act (reauthorized in 1991), tribes were authorized to contract with the federal government to administer schools for Indian children. Section 2 (b) (3) emphasized that parental and community control of the

educational process was of crucial importance to Indian people. Part A-Education of Indians in Public Schools addressed parental input specifically in Section 5 (a) "whenever a school district affected by a contract...has a local school board not composed of a majority of Indians, that parents of the Indian children enrolled in the school/s affected shall elect a local committee from among their number. Such committee shall participate fully in the development, and shall have the authority to approve/disapprove programs to be conducted under such contract/s.

The language of this Act specifically underscores Congress' intent to "promote maximum Indian participation in the government and education of Indian people." (See H.R. Rep. No. 1600, 93rd Congress, lst Sess.1 (1974)). While the focus of this legislation is not education, the Act does reflect the beginning of an era which underscores and begins to reestablish tribal sovereignty. Tribal sovereignty is a prerequisite for the establishment of policies and programs which reflect the wishes of local communities, i.e., parents in the educational programs designed for their children.

In 1975, Congress passed The Education of All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142. Parents of students with handicaps were assured the right to participate in the assessment and program planning process for their children through P.L. 94-142. For the first time all parents were to become partners with professionals in the decision-making process. Studies by educational researchers (Lynch and Stein, 1989) found that one of the major inhibitors to this shared decision-making was language. Many language minority students were form homes where English was the second language. Many families did not speak the language of the majority culture--the language of IEPs. Problems with decision-making opportunities for Indian parents have been compounded by the fact that there are very few minority personnel in special education and the tools for assessment remain culturally biased.

One concern by Indian parents has been assessment and placement into programs. Despite change and the inclusion of additional criteria for labeling children, a disproportionate number of Indian students continue to be labeled for special education purposes. For years, there was substantial support for the notion that minority language students were likely to be slow learners, if not because of low mental ability, then because of the disadvantage of their language handicap. This Act is another example of

legislation directed at a non-minority group which has had significant impact on the education of Indian children.

In 1978, Congress passed several Education Amendments in P.L. 95-561. One of the riders of this legislation was directed at schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In response to the increased awareness in Indian country of the needs of Indian students and the limited ability of the Bureau to respond to local concerns, this law was intended to authorize parental involvement by redefining the role of the local school board. The local boards of Bureau schools were given more specific authority over general decision-making at the schools, including a voice in the hiring of school officials, specifically administrative positions.

In practice, the authority relinquished to parent school boards was determined by the local school administrator and/or the local school superintendent (Education Program Administrator). For some schools, decision-making was more participatory than at others, since the fiscal accountability still resided with the school administrators. So while the intent was to provide local boards with a larger role in the control of local schools, this was not guaranteed by provisions within the law. In an examination of the language of the law, one can readily see the narrow focus. This Act established the official policy of the BIA to "facilitate Indian control of Indian affairs in all matters relating to education."

In that same year, Congress passed the Indian Child Welfare Act. This Act was designed to protect the integrity of tribes and the heritage of Indian children by inhibiting the practice of removing those children from their families and tribes to raise them as non-Indians. Cf. Wakefield v. little Light, 276 Md. 333, 347, A 2d 288 (1975). Under the Act, state courts have no jurisdiction over adoption or custody of Indian children who are domiciled or reside within the reservation of their tribe, unless some federal law (such as Public Law 280) confers such jurisdiction. The Act has been held to preempt a state rule that would have shifted the domicile of an abandoned Indian child from that of the parent on the reservation to his would-be adoptive parents off the reservation. Matter of Adoption of Halloway, 732 P2d. 962 (Utah, 1986). State courts have no jurisdiction over children who are wards of a tribal court, regardless of domicile or residence. Jurisdiction of these cases lies exclusively with the tribe. State courts have some jurisdiction over adoption and custody of Indian children not domiciled or residing on their

tribe's reservation, but this jurisdiction is subject to important qualifications. For example, in any proceeding for foster care placement or termination of parental rights, the state court "in the absence of good cause to the contrary" and in the absence of objection by either parent, must transfer the proceeding to tribal court upon the petition of either parent, the child's Indian custodian, or the tribe. The tribe may decline such a transfer. 25 U.S.C.A. § 1911 (b). The states are required to give tribal adoption and custody orders full faith and credit. 25 U.S.C.A. § 1911. (d).

While not specifically addressing education, the law reinforces other legislation. Indian parental rights are, for the most part, subjugated to the wishes of the tribe in matters of welfare for a child, including education. The primary consideration here is the opportunity for the child to remain cognizant of the culture (including language) in order to protect the identity of the group and ultimately the individual.

It is nearly ten years before we find legislation which addresses specific needs of Indian communities for education services. This legislation, The Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvement Amendments of 1988 (P.L. 100-297) passed on April 28 and strengthened the role of parental involvement in Indian schools by authorizing resources.

Prior to this time, an Indian school board could contract, through the tribe, to operate a school; however, there were still layers of fiscal management which diverted money from local school operations. This Act authorized the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide outright grants to tribally controlled schools. Local school boards were provided with more autonomy to make curricular and operational decisions.

On October 30, 1990, President Bush signed The Native American Languages Act which Congress had passed to protect the "status of the cultures and languages of Native Americans (a)s unique." Further, it stated that the United States "has the responsibility to act together with native Americans to ensure the survival of these unique cultures and languages (p. 1153). Congress made it a policy of the United States to "preserve, protect, and promote the rights and freedom of Native Americans to use, practice, and develop Native American Language" (p. 11155). Finally, the Act emphasized that "the right of Native Americans to express themselves through the use of Native American languages shall

not be restricted in any public proceeding, including publicly supported educational program(s)". (p. 1155-1156).

The implications of this Act for Indian parents are obvious. First from a general administrative perspective, the Act continues the policy of Indian self-determination, particularly as it pertains to the tribal government authority when acting for parents. Second, it is a reversal of the assimilation practices/policies which discouraged parents from teaching Native language to their children.

The most significant Supreme Court ruling on language usage relies solely on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as interpreted by the Office of Civil Rights. The Court noted that to require that children have required basic English skills before participating in an educational program "mocks" public education. In Lau v. Nichols, the Supreme Court did not propose a remedy for bilingual students; however, it did propose that schools provide one. There have been no cases adjudicated as a result of limited English proficiency by Native American students; however, in 1968 Congress authorized the Bilingual Education Act (reauthorized in 1978) which has provided grants for bilingual education projects, related research and teacher training for bilingual students.

Summary

Indian control, whether defined as the individual parent, parental school board or committee, or tribal council has had legislative (and presidential) support since the passage of the Indian Self-Determination Act in 1978. The legal framework for involvement of Indian parents in the education of their children has its basis in current federal statutes. Several laws which impact Indian students were incorporated in legislation which sought to protect parental rights in this country (e.g., Education of all Handicapped Children Act), yet have far reaching consequences for the involvement of parents in Indian education. Silverman (1992) asserts that tribal control over education has received more federal deference than the interests of other parents in this country. Some evidence for this can be found in the legislation directed at the operation of public school programs specifically for Indian students and the legislation which has redefined the role of Indian parents in the operation of Bureau of Indian Affairs funded schools.

Historically, Indian parents have only recently been provided opportunities to be involved in local decision-making. In boarding schools, parents have acquiesced to the doctrine of *in loco parents* (Briscoe,

1980). The operation of schools, particularly those funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs have routed parental grievances and complaints through the federal system and parents have not used the federal courts.

While the authority for overseeing the federal trust responsibility for Indian people remains with the BIA, contemporary educational agenda have been directed to include laws and regulations which impact public school districts as well. The framework for parental involvement is grounded in various laws; however, changes in decision-making more realistically respond to individual and group parental voices.

References

Public Laws

Augustus f. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Improvements Act of 1988, P. L. 100-297.

Bilingual Educcation Act, 20 U.S.C. § 3281-3341 (1988).

Education Amendments of 1978; 25 U.S.C. § 2001-2019 (1991).

Education of All Handicapped Children Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (1975).

Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. § 2701-2713.

Impact Aid, 20 U.S.C. § 236-45 (1991).

Indian Child Welfare Act, 25 U.S.C. § 1901-1963 (1978).

Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance, 25 U.S.C. § 2601-2651 (1991).

Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, U.S.C. § 450 (1991).

Johnson O'Malley Act, 25 U.S.C. § 452-57 (1991).

Native American Languages Act, 25 U.S.C. § 2903 (1990).

Articles

Briscoe, L. S. (1980). The legal background of *in loco parentis* as applied to the education of Indian children. Emergent Leadership. Vol. IV, No. 2. pp 24-31.

Lynch, E. W. and Stein, R.C. (1987) Parent participation by ethnicity. Exceptional Children.Vol 54, No. 2, pp. 105-111.

Silverman, J.E. (1992). The miner's canary: Tribal control of American Indian Education and the First Amendment. Fordham Urban Law Journal. 19, 1019-1046.

Thompson, E. (1990). Protecting abused children: A judge's perspective on public law deprived child proceedings and the impact of the Indian Child Welfare Acts. American Indian Law Review. University of Oklahoma College of Law. Volume XV, No l. p. 1-114.

Books

Canby, W.C. (1988). American Indian Law. West Publishing Co. St. Paul: MN.

Deloria, Vine Jr. and Lythe, C. M. (1983). American Indians, American Justice. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.

Prucha, F. P. (1990). Documents of United States Indian Policy. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE.

Cases

Arizona v. California, 460 U.S. 605, 626-28 (1983).

Lau v. Nichols, 483 F2d 791, 797 (9th Cir 1973), Rev'd 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Matter of Adoption of Halloway, 732 P2d. 962 (Utah, 1986).

Nevada v. United States, 463 U.S. 110, 127 (1983).

Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indian v. U.S., 324 U.S. 335,355 (1945). reh'g denied; 324 U.S. 890 (1945).

Prince V. Board of Education, 88 NM 548, 556 (1975).

Wakefield V. Little Light, 276 Md. 333, 347 A2d 288 (1975).